

This fact is recognised in the teaching of Swedish drill by the best methods, in which the pupil is told which special muscles each exercise is intended to develop, and so he can concentrate his thought on those particular muscles, thus gaining the fullest possible benefit from the exercise.

So in Sloyd; if the hand is made to move mechanically, guided by the steel angle, the muscles are not under the control of the will, and so do *not* receive the fullest possible benefit from the exercise.

The chief reason why so many people seem quite unable to draw, is that they have not the muscles of the hand sufficiently under control to obey the impulse of the will, or to follow the mental image they have made and wish to reproduce.

Sloyd should be a great help to drawing, as drawing is to Sloyd, in the control acquired over the muscles of the hand.

One very important point in teaching Sloyd is that every detail of the work must be absolutely true. Not a single crooked line, imperfectly joined corner, or inaccurate measurement may be allowed, and the inside work that is to be covered up must be just as neat as that which will be visible in the finished model.

Thus the child will learn the value and importance of beautiful and perfect work, and will bring this lesson that he has learnt into everything he does.

Sloyd also gives training in patience and perseverance in finishing carefully all the minute details of a model.

People will perhaps say that it is a pity to spend much time over one handicraft when there is so much to be learnt of more importance than Sloyd.

Other subjects may, perhaps, be of more importance from a purely utilitarian point of view, but surely that is not the only point from which we regard the subjects of the school curriculum?

We require of the subjects also that they shall give inspiring ideas, widen the horizon of thought, give new interests, and last, but not least, help the child to form new relations with things or materials outside himself.

Sloyd, I think, fulfils all these conditions to a great extent, and therefore has an important place as an instrument of education.

CHIVALRY.

NOTES ON EXTENSION LECTURES GIVEN BY THE REV. J.

HUDSON SHAW.

"Chivalry," as we now understand the term, was the ideal social code of the middle ages. It was at once a theory of life and a standard of conduct. The Roman Empire had two conflicting social ideals—Stoicism and Epicureanism; the Christian world had monasticism and chivalry. Chivalry was the *logical outcome of Christianity*, grafted upon the rotting and decaying Roman Order. When the framework of the Empire broke down, and the feudal institutions gradually came into being, there was room in the world for a privileged Order like the old Roman citizens, but owing allegiance and service no longer to a State but to an overlord; and there were but two tests of admittance into this cosmopolitan order—birth and the prowess of military attainments. The honour of knighthood was the only practical Christianity for the man with noble instincts who was not yet a monk. The religious complexion largely owed its origin to the cause which first united and banded together the semi-savage nationalities of the peoples of modern Europe. The Crusades consecrated military glory to a cause. The vows of knighthood, chastity, service of the weak, fidelity were often ill kept, but at least they pointed to the aim of soldiers of the Cross. Association with the higher civilisation and far stricter personal codes of the East made good faith and hospitality Western as well as biblical virtues. In a modern novel the situation has been well put from the point of view of an 11th Century Crusader:—

"I hold that the belted knight is consecrated priest;

"standing in the world he should behold its sin and violence
 "yet keep his own heart pure, should lay low the wicked,
 "lift up the weak; for God has set him apart to pray, not
 "with his lips but with his good sword, and he should ride
 "to each mêlée as to a sacrament."

Thus would the ideal knight speak, watching his arms in some silent chapel before his investiture. But chivalry was not really social; its weak point lay in its individual character. Military glory was won by personal combat, and knighthood was to be won and honour to be upheld by single combats on the field of battle or duels à l'outrance. It exalted "honour" into a fetich and at the same moment degraded it to a mere technicality. To be overborne was to be disgraced; to massacre hapless non-combatants was an ordinary precaution. Chastity came to mean simply allegiance to the declared "lady" whose colours the knight wore, for as long as he fought under those colours—but no longer.

Chivalry by the middle of the 13th century had become formal and self-conscious. Its earlier Orders, the Templars of St. John of Jerusalem, were *semi-monastic*, pledged to some great work; its later manifestations as the Order of the Garter had their origin in the perverted ideas of honour which made fair fame of more account than integrity. Heraldry, Edward III's courts of chivalry, the courts of love, the tournaments in which only "gentlemen of birth" and "gentlemen of ancestry" could compete, show how the religious impulse had died away and personal dignities alone remained. Knight Errantry, the attempt of the individual to repair the wrongs of the world, had led men to ignore the plain obvious duties at their gates, and allegiance had become a matter of choice rather than of circumstance, and "faith unfaithful kept men falsely true."

The pages of Sir Thomas Malory's "Morte d'Arthur" are a striking commentary on mediæval chivalry. Galahad, the ideal knight, contrasted with Lancelot the real. The astounding combinations of Mass and intrigue, worship and violence, are typical of these ages. Nowhere do we see so plainly the main trends of chivalry, the worship of women, and the false doctrine "noblesse oblige." The Teutonic reverence for the Aluna wives had been merged with the

Greek cult of Venus, the Egyptian reverence for Isis, and by the genius of the Christian Church transformed into the cult of the Virgin. That every woman should find a protector and avenger in every man is a beautiful theory; the pages of Sir Thomas Malory are full of "straightway there rode a damsel unto King Arthur" with wrongs to redress or a cause to be contended.

On the other hand woman was not expected or required to conform to a man's code of honour: she was an angel when kind, a devil and a temptress when undesired; but her fair fame, like the knight's, was of vastly more account than her strict morality. Sir Lancelot's final championship of Queen Guinevere is the most striking testimony to the prevailing code.

The other radical defect of chivalry was that it exacted and required a rigid standard only amongst equals—the serf, the villein, the peasant had no rights and were held incapable of understanding the knightly point of view. But "nobility obliged" the "perfect gentle knight" so to act towards them that his own name was not tarnished. In short, class dictated behaviour to those who possessed its distinctions, but the masses had no rights or courtesies but those conferred by their superiors.

The decay of chivalry was inherent from the beginning, and rapid after the fourteenth century. The end of the feudal system removed its great outwork bulwark. The introduction of learning made the pursuit of letters as noble as the profession of arms, and to be a magnificent patron—a Lorenzo de Medici—was more than to be a paladin even as Bayard, the renaissance substituted the thinker for the soldier. The invention of gunpowder by changing the whole nature of fighting did away with the valour of personal feats of arms, generalship was needed, not to "ride a great wallop and strike together." The more settled conditions of life made it possible for men to find other honourable pursuits besides arms, and finally the reformation taught men that God could be served in the world, *as well as in the cloister*, even by those who held this earth "a vain and fleeting show," as did the Puritans. The lip service of the eighteenth century to its "belles" and "toasts" was the last remnant of the chivalric woman worship; gradually men were coming to

see that these strange creatures were not so remote from themselves after all, and they took them into their lives as companions when they dethroned them as goddesses.

Duelling, with its insistence on personal honour and a stainless name, was the last social relic of chivalry, and that too expired in the nineteenth century at home and has fallen from its high estate abroad. The individualism of chivalry has given place to the organised philanthropy of to-day: its woman worship, to woman's recognition, its catchword "noblesse oblige" to that other phrase "the rights of man."

The Christian Socialist of to-day seeks the same religious basis for life and conduct, but he substitutes arbitration for "the appeal to arms," and Unions and Guilds for "the Round Table." There are dragons in plenty for every age to slaughter, but it is absurd to deplore the decay of chivalry when the dragons of St. George are passed away—to exchange its own ideals and its own weapons—and a modern man may be as great a champion of right, and as true a lover and Christian, as Amodis of Gaul or King Arthur or Roland.

SIR SIMON DE MONTFORT.

NOTES ON EXTENSION LECTURES ON MEDIÆVAL ENGLAND.

Imagination is prone to distort or transfigure the picturesque figures of history—they tend inevitably to be reproduced in its pages as saints in a stained glass window or grotesques.

"Sir Simon the Righteous" has been hailed as the saviour—if not as the creator—of English liberties; and on the other hand, he has been depicted as no better than the rest of the crowd of adventurers from afar who swarmed in the Court of Henry III.

Yet it is an anachronism to speak of patriots before the days of national feeling. It was not until the Reformation that Europe was divided into water-tight compartments, and that England became truly insular. In the days of the Plantagenets the ruling classes of all countries were cosmopolitan. The Montforts had lands in the north and south of France—utterly different countries, then speaking different tongues—as well as fiefs in England, and they were no exceptions to the general rule. National feeling was as yet in its infancy, and the outcry against "aliens," which was first heard in Henry III. reign, was largely based on the feeling, prevalent to-day, that they should only be admitted on a property qualification! The owner of the de Valence lands in Kent, and the claimant of the Earldom of Leicester, was very unlike the needy Provencials, who looked to the King to give them a "stake in the country."

But devotion to a cause was one of the brightest traits in mediæval character. It was this enthusiasm which had sent the armies of Europe into the East, and which had raised against the Albigensian heretics of Southern France the banner of the first Earl Simon. Something of the old

chivalric spirit that prompted a knight to redress any wrongs in Christendom shone as a golden thread through the mined warp and woof of many conflicting motives.

Men fought not for a country, but for a principle—a clause of a creed—a conception of government, &c. Where then had Sir Simon de Montfort learnt to prize so highly the cause of civil liberty?

His early years had been spent—at least partially—in Southern France, and there, in her cities and institutions, yet lingered many of the Roman republican institutions in the “communes” of the towns; there at least citizenship still retained somewhat of its ancient import.

When he came to England his title was of Leicester, but his lands were also in Kent, where to this day at Sitten Valence the ruins of his tower keep watch and ward over the marches of the Weald. The men of Kent have ever had a sturdy independence and a number of institutions of their own, which could not fail to strike a man who was already too much a citizen of the world to be blended by the usual caste prejudices—a people who clung to “gavelkind” were little likely to exalt the baronage at the expense of the people, or to look upon the land as an appurtenance of the King.

Thus, then, when “Sir Simon the Righteous” appeared as the champion of English liberties, he had learned in two provinces and practised in a third, for he had already in Gascony had experience in administering institutions which again differed from the English idea of government.

It was no love of an individual people but a right apprehension of orderly government which brought the Earl of Leicester into conflict with his suzerain. Add to this the innumerable personal motives which on both sides obscured the main issue, and then we can better understand the apparent lapses from a high standard of public conduct on which some have fastened to Montfort's discredit.

In the placing of the government in the hands of three unwieldy committees, and in the summoning of burghers for the first time to the National Council, Sir Simon was neither an inspired statesman nor a bungling politician. He probably realized not at all that his famous Parliament was the prophecy of the English constitution. The cause of order

is organization in every department of the State, and to that cause he had devoted himself.

His friends and advisers were Churchmen—far too Catholic to be patriotic as we understand the term—but far too independent and assured of their right of self-government to side with Rome and the King in the struggle. Free institutions were as necessary for the growth of the Church in England as of the State, and it is only since the Reformation that the Roman Church at home has submitted to authority as it did for a brief space on the fall of that champion of civil and ecclesiastical rights—Simon de Montfort.

His death under the pear trees of Evesham left England eventually to his pupil—Edward I.; a man whose ideal of justice had a deeper national tinge, and who worked out the hopes of English freedom on a wider basis.

Sir Simon was the forerunner who preaches a gospel he but half understands—which is thus incomplete in spite of his sincerity. He was also a very human man in an age that knew very little of self-control; so where the historian looks for settled policy, the student of human nature finds flaws—his personal treatment of Henry III., for example.

Like a famous politician of our own age, the fact that he was a religious man has obscured for many the fact that he was not necessarily an inspired statesman. But a nation is not saved by Parliaments or even Acts of Parliament—its captain figures can redeem it by raising its ideals. And that undoubtedly Simon de Montfort effected. He set an example of devotion to a cause; he set a model, however imperfectly, before the people of their place in the orderly government of their country; and by dying he saved himself from the imputation of having fought only for his own hand—and won, like any “robber baron.”

It is a real service to a people to act before them a *role* which they can dub a hero's, and believe a martyr's. To-day we still reap; and it matters little whether in the days of old they sowed deliberately for our benefit, or whether our constitution and free institutions spring in reality from wild wheat from the outside of the feudal force.

February 4th, 1906.